



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,433	08/08/2006	Gilles Pain	010180.00049	9995
22507	7590	05/13/2008	EXAMINER	
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. 1100 13th STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051			JARRELL, NOBLE E	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
			1624	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
05/13/2008			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/568,433	Applicant(s) PAIN ET AL.
	Examiner Noble Jarrell	Art Unit 1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 and 26-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11,13-24 and 26-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement (PTO/1449B)
 Paper No./Mail Date 2/14/06; 8/8/06
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No./Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of III in the reply filed on 4/8/08 is acknowledged.
2. Claim 12 is withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 4/8/08.

Specification

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1, 5-8, 12-13, and 20-24 are objected to because of the following informalities: non-elected subject matter is contained within these claims. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
6. Claims 1-11, 13-24, and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for enantiomer(s), diastereomers(s), or salt(s) of

formula I, does not reasonably provide enablement for a hydrate or solvate of formula I. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. While applicants are enabled for the preparation of for enantiomer(s), diastereomers(s), or salt(s) of formula I, they do not show solvates or hydrates of formula I can be prepared.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir., 1988). The court in Wands states, "Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation, such as routine screening. However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue', not 'experimentation'" (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to make or use the invention. "Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations" (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Among these factors are: (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the breadth of the claims; (3) the state of the prior art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the relative skill of those in the art; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

Consideration of the relevant factors sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case for lack of enablement is set forth herein below:

(1) The nature of the invention and (2) the breadth of the claims:

The claims are drawn to compounds and compositions of formula I, where formula I is composed of a piperazine ring connected to a phenyl ring through an alkyl-C(O) linker. The linker is modified with a C(OR)(C(O)NHOH) group, where variable R is hydrogen, alkyl, or cycloalkyl.

(3) The state of the prior art and (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art:

Vippagunta et al. (*Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*, 2001, 48, 3-26) teach that solvate or hydrate formation is unpredictable even within a series of related molecules because each compound responds uniquely to solvate formation (page 18, section 3.4).

Art Unit: 1624

(5) The relative skill of those in the art:

One of ordinary skill in the art can replicate the preparation of example 62 of the specification (pages 60-67).

(6) The amount of direction or guidance presented and (7) the presence or absence of working examples:

The specification has provided guidance for preparation of for enantiomer(s), diastereomers(s), or salt(s) of formula I.

However, the specification does not provide guidance for preparation of a solvate or hydrate of formula I.

(8) The quantity of experimentation necessary:

Considering the state of the art as discussed by the references above, particularly with regards to claims 1-11, 13-24, and 26-30 and the high unpredictability in the art as evidenced therein, and the lack of guidance provided in the specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would be burdened with undue experimentation to practice the invention commensurate in the scope of the claims.

7. Claims 24 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treatment of arthritis or osteoarthritis, does not reasonably provide enablement for any of the disorders listed in claims 26 or 27. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Applicants are enabled for treatment of arthritis (associated with both MMP 9 and MMP 12) or osteoarthritis (associated with MMP 9).

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In re Wands*,

Art Unit: 1624

858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir., 1988). The court in Wands states, "Enabling is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation, such as routine screening. However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue', not 'experimentation'" (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to make or use the invention. "Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations" (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Among these factors are: (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the breadth of the claims; (3) the state of the prior art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the relative skill of those in the art; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

Consideration of the relevant factors sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case for lack of enablement is set forth herein below:

(1) The nature of the invention and (2) the breadth of the claims:

The claims are drawn to treatment or prevention of disorder related to inhibition of MMP 9 or 12 with a compound of formula I or a composition comprising the same.

(3) The state of the prior art and (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art:

Clark et al. (*Expert Opinion in Therapeutic Targets*, 2003, 7(1), 19-34) teach that arthritis is related to inhibition of MMP 9. Roach (*Expert Opinion in Drug Discovery*, 2008, 3(5), 475-86) teaches that MMP 9 is related to cartilage erosion, and in turn, osteoarthritis.

Both osteoarthritis and arthritis are not preventable with drugs, but by other methods

("Osteoarthritis Prevention - WebMD",

<http://www.webmd.com/osteoarthritis/tc/osteoarthritis-prevention>, accessed May 5, 2008;

"Arthritis Prevention", <http://www.symptomsofarthritis.com/arthritis-Prevention.html>,

accessed May 5, 2008)

(5) The relative skill of those in the art:

One of ordinary skill in the art can perform a biological assay as described on pages 70-71 of the specification.

(6) *The amount of direction or guidance presented and (7) the presence or absence of working examples:*

The specification has provided guidance for treatment of arthritis or osteoarthritis.

However, the specification does not provide guidance that every disorders associated with inhibition of MMP 9 or MMP 12 can be treated or prevented with a compound of formula I or a composition comprising the same..

(8) *The quantity of experimentation necessary:*

Considering the state of the art as discussed by the references above, particularly with regards to claims 24 and 26-27 and the high unpredictability in the art as evidenced therein, and the lack of guidance provided in the specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would be burdened with undue experimentation to practice the invention commensurate in the scope of the claims.

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1-11, 13-24, and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Is claim 23 a claim to a compound of formula I or is it a claim to a composition comprising a compound of formula I? A medicament is a composition. Claims 1-11, 13-24, and 26-30 are indefinite due to the multiple occurrences of "optionally substituted" chemical moieties such as "optionally substituted aryl". Because claims 2-11, 13-24, and 26-30 depend on claim 1, they are rendered indefinite as well. The specification gives no guidance to what the intended substituents are. Each occurrence of an "optionally substituted" groups in these claims renders the claims indefinite.

Art Unit: 1624

10. Regarding claim 26, the phrase "e.g." renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

11. Claims 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: the reagents required for the conversion of a compound of formula IIIB to a compound of formula IA.

Conclusion

12. No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Noble Jarrell whose telephone number is (571) 272-9077. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 A.M - 6:00 P.M. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. James O. Wilson can be reached on (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Noble Jarrell/
Examiner, Art Unit 1624

**/James O. Wilson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1624**